

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/719,993	CARGILL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Juliet C. Switzer	1634	

**All Participants:**

(1) Juliet C. Switzer.

(2) Ben Wang.

**Status of Application:** election

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 26 October 2006

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 2, 4, 6, 36

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner and Mr. Wang discussed possible amendments to place the application in condition for allowance. However, subsequent to the conversation, the examiner updated the search and discovered post-filing date references that provided evidence of lack of enablement. Due to these references, the offer of allowable subject matter was withdrawn in favor of a first action on the merits to explore the question of enablement of the claimed invention. .